INFORMATION FOR ELECTORS

NO. 7.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

PAGE.

GRIT ECONOMY—DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL.....2

INCREASED PROVINCIAL TAXATION.....5

LIBERAL CORRUPTION AT ELECTIONS.....6

THE LIBERAL PARTY AND SUPERANNUATION.....8

EFFORTS TO SECURE RECIPROCITY WITH UNITED STATES....12

THE LIBERALS AND AUSTRALIAN TRADE.....14

THE LESSON OF THE UNITED STATES.....15

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.....16

ITEMS COMPOSING PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA.....16

To secure copies of this pamphlet or any of the series, address

ROBT. BIRMINGHAM,

SECRETARY LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE UNION,

49 KING ST. WEST, TORONTO, ONT.

GRIT ECONOMY -- DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL.

One plank in the Grit platform is economy in public expenditure. They declare that the Liberal-Conservative Government has been extravagant in expenditures and reckless in increasing the debt. Let us in power, they say, and all this will be changed. Will it?

How shall we judge?

1. BY THE EXAMPLE OF THE GRITS IN 1874 TO 1879 WHEN THEY WERE IN POWER IN CANADA?

In that period of five years they increased both expenditure and debt.

The total expenditure in 1872-3, the last year of Conservative Government, was	$ 19,174,647
The total expenditure 1877-8, the last full year of Grit administration, was	23,503,158

The increase was $4,328,511, or about 22 per cent.

The total debt in 1872-3 was	99,848,461
The total debt in 1877-8 was	140,362,069

Or an increase of $40,513,608, or over 40 per cent.

Take a like period of Liberal-Conservative rule and compare it:

The total expenditure in 1890-1 was	36,343,568
The total expenditure in 1894-5 was	38,122,005

The increase was $1,778,437, or less than 5 per cent.

The total debt in 1890-1 was	237,809,030
The total debt in 1894-5 was	253,074,927

An increase of $15,265,897, or less than 6 per cent.

That is, in the five years of Grit administration the expenditure increased 22 per cent. and the debt increased 40 per cent.; in the last five years of Liberal-Conservative government the increase of expenditure and of debt was in each case less than 6 per cent.

2. BY THE EXAMPLE OF GRITS IN PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS?

The Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, P. E. I. and Manitoba have for several years been, and, with the exception of Quebec, are now under Grit rule. In New Brunswick the leader and controlling power in the Cabinet is a Grit.

What have been the results in these Provinces? Has it been a lessened expenditure, a decrease of taxation, and a stationary debt?

No. The very opposite in every case.

Let us take the Provinces in order:

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

The public debt of Prince Edward Island is small, but it has increased during the five last years, which were years of Liberal administration, until it is three times what it was in 1891, notwithstanding the fact that the revenue at the disposal of the Government has been increased largely by a very odious tax imposed directly on land, and a tax upon income. For the last year a deficit of over $100,000, or one dollar per head of its population, has to be borne, notwithstanding that the Grit Government in the Island has laid on new taxes from year to year. To-day Mr. Peters,

the Premier, is working for the advent of Mr. Laurier to power, so as to make a raid upon the Dominion treasury to save him from the result of lavish expenditures.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

In New Brunswick the Conservative administration was defeated in 1883, and since that time the Government has been under the leadership of Mr. Blair, a Liberal. At the time of the change the bonded indebtedness of the Province was $876,600, and the floating debt $321,374, making the gross debt in all $1,197,974. Against this amount there must be reckoned two assets which were shortly afterwards realized upon, viz., $150,000 Eastern Extension Railway claim, and $604,519 interest on the amount allowed the Province by the Dominion under the readjustment of Provincial debts in 1873. At the time of the defeat of the Liberal-Conservative administration in 1883 the net debt was therefore $443,455. At the close of the last fiscal year the net debt of the Province, exclusive of floating indebtedness other than to banks, which had not been paid, was $2,321,412.66. The average annual revenue since 1883 has been upwards of $70,000 more than the average annual revenue for the five years preceding the change of Government.

NOVA SCOTIA.

In 1882 the Holmes-Thompson Government, a Conservative administration, went out of power, and a Liberal Government succeeded, which has continued to the present time. At the time of the change, the total public debt of Nova Scotia was $312,766, and the Liberals have increased this indebtedness until on the 30th day of December, 1895, it stood at $3,346,899.99, and this indebtedness was in addition to the amount of $1,284,311 which on the 30th June, 1884, was paid by the Dominion Government to the Government of Nova Scotia for the purchase of the Eastern Extension Railway. This reckless extravagance is intensified by the fact that under the Liberal administration the average annual revenue was $666,000, while the average annual revenue under the preceding Government was only $545,000.

QUEBEC.

When the Conservative administration went out of power and the Liberal administration of Mercier came in, the net debt was $11,389,167.11. During the four or five years of Liberal rule, which continued to December the 7th, 1891, the net debt increased to $24,288,038.20—or has more than doubled. During the Liberal rule the Government had an average annual revenue of nearly $1,000,000 more than the average annual revenue during the five previous years of Conservative administration.

Quebec, under Liberal administration, was disgraced by the most flagrant corruption in public finances that any country in civilized times has seen.

Parasites and heelers toiled every contract, bought and sold positions, shared proceeds with Grit Ministers, and, in short, held high carnival. So gross and open became the corruption that the Governor dismissed Mr. Mercier, and the people overwhelmingly defeated him in his appeal thereafter. The Langellers and Pacauds, Tartes and "Jimmy" McShane figured at this time in a most unenviable way. They are still hungry, and are to-day the intimate counsellors and assistants of Mr. Laurier.

ONTARIO.

When John Sandfield Macdonald's Government was defeated in Ontario and the Liberals came into power, the Province had a cash surplus of $3,814,510, apart from the trust funds held by the Dominion Government for the Province, amounting to about $3,000,000. There was a debt then due the Dominion Government, but this was wiped out by the readjustment of the Provincial debts in 1873, so it need not be taken into account. On the first day of January, 1896, the Province held drainage and other

debentures to the amount of $470,000 and cash in banks to the amount of $437,580, amounting in all to $907,000, or nearly $3,000,000 less than the cash surplus which John Sandfield Macdonald had left. Besides using up this $3,000,000 of the cash surplus the Mowat Government has drawn on the trust funds to the extent of $2,000,000, and has incurred indebtedness for railway aid certificates and annuities to the amount of $2,734,000. The Province is therefore worse off at the present time than when John Sandfield Macdonald went out of power by the amount of $7,734,000.

This showing is sufficiently bad in itself; but the electors, in order to grasp the significance of Liberal rule, must bear in mind the fact that the average revenue under Liberal Governments, by whom $7,734,000 has been sunk, is about $740,000 more than the annual average revenue during the administration of John Sandfield Macdonald when he accumulated the surplus of over $3,800,000.

MANITOBA.

Manitoba affords another example of Liberal financing. Mr. Greenway took office in 1888. The expenditure then was $520,000. For last year it stood at $880,000, an increase of $370,000. The debt during these years has grown from $2,220,000 to $4,500,000. In a word, it has doubled.

What do you think of this record for economy?

But these same men will be the helpers and Ministers with whom Mr. Laurier, if he is returned to power, will surround himself. Can the Ethopian change his skin? What the Grit has done in the comparatively dry tree of Provincial revenues, will he not all the more do in the green tree of Dominion revenues?

3. BY THE DEMANDS OF THE PROVINCIAL PREMIERS AND THE PROMISE OF MR. LAURIER?

In 1886 Mr. Mercier devised a scheme for raiding the Dominion treasury and filling the depleted treasuries of Quebec in particular, and the other Provinces in general. He roped in the Premiers of all the other Provinces, except British Columbia and P. E. Island, which were not then under Grit administration.

The scheme was to force about $2,000,000 annually from the Dominion as increased subsidies to the Provinces—to make up for their extravagances. In the elections of 1891, Mr. Mercier demanded from Mr. Laurier, as the price of his support in Quebec, that Mr. Laurier give him a pledge that if he were elected he would, when he got hold of the reins at Ottawa, grant this additional amount to Quebec, and of course to the other Provinces. Mr. Laurier gave the pledge—as shameful an attempt to bribe by wholesale as ever was made, and when questioned in Parliament he admitted it.

Mr. Peters, the Provincial Premier in P. E. I., only a few days ago voiced this motive for the cry "On to Ottawa," which all the Grit Premiers have taken up. He said:—

"When the Legislature met last year, they thought they were on the eve of a Dominion election and of a change of Government. This year there could be no miss-fire about the general election, and he hoped and believed that the hour of deliverance from the present Ottawa Government was also at hand. With a change of Government 'our just claims' would be paid, and this would put the Province in a better financial position. He eulogized Mr. Laurier as a just man, favorable to increasing the Provincial subsidies, and hoped for his early advent to power."

With the record of the Grits when in power in 1873-8, with the record of Grit administration in the Provinces, with the pledge of Mr. Laurier to increase the grants to the Provinces to help out Grit extravagance there, and with the Tartes, the Langeliers, the Pacauds, the Prefontains, and "Jimmy" McShane to the front what does the honest electors think of the prospects for lessened expenditure and greater economy?

INCREASED PROVINCIAL TAXATION.

While increasing their debts, their expenditure and their deficits, the Liberal Provincial authorities have also imposed additional taxation upon the people. The following are some of the taxes thus imposed or increased to meet the effects of Liberal extravagance in the various Provinces:

ONTARIO.

The Liberal Government of Ontario has imposed succession duties ranging from 2½ to 10 per cent., and by recent legislation grants made by the living within a certain period from their death. It has exacted mining royalties of 2 and 3 per cent. on the output, seriously checking the development of mines. It has time and again increased the share of the liquor licenses going to the Provinces and diminished the share going to the municipalities, which now get the smaller portion, instead of the much larger portion as formerly, thus necessitating additional municipal taxes. In many other ways it has transferred financial burdens from its own shoulders to those of the municipalities. Among minor taxes is the license for hunting game.

QUEBEC.

The unexampled extravagance of the Mercier administration has caused heavy burden to be placed upon the people of Quebec wherever possible. There are not only succession duties ranging from 1 to 10 per cent., but also a tax on transfers of real estate. Taxes have been placed on insurance companies, fire and life, on banks, loan companies, rail and tramways, telegraph and telephone companies, navigation companies and commercial corporations. Doctors, lawyers, veterinary surgeons, civil engineers, architects, surveyors, artists, musicians, etc., have to pay taxes to the Provincial treasury. Every trade or business has to pay a tax. Liquor license fees have been increased, and go mainly to the Province, which also takes the increased license fees from auctioneers, druggists, pawnbrokers, powder sellers, circuses, menageries, etc. Permits to hunt and shoot call for a payment to the Province. The stumpage dues on timber were raised. Mining royalties of 3 per cent. were imposed, and the law made retroactive applying to land that had been granted without reserve of the minerals, the burden being so heavy as to cause many mines to close.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

The Liberal Government of New Brunswick increased the stumpage duties on timber from 80 cents to $1 a thousand. It imposed succession duties, taxes on banks, insurance companies, telephone companies, railways, etc. To relieve the Provincial treasury last winter the Government proposed to increase the county school tax from 30 cents to 50 cents per head of the population, and they took over half the liquor license fees. All this taxation has been imposed since 1890, and in addition to these taxes the Government has systematically pursued a policy of unloading on the municipalities matters which under the Conservative administration had been paid for by the Provincial Government.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The royalty on coal has been increased by the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia. Succession duties ranging from 2½ to 10 per cent. have been imposed.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

The Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island has imposed a land tax, the farmers having to make a declaration of the number and value of their acres, upon which a tax for the Provincial treasury is levied, while the smaller plots of land do not escape, as they are taxed on their value. Insurance companies, banks, building and loan societies, telegraph companies and incorporated companies generally have to pay a tax to the Province. There is a tax upon incomes of one per cent.. Succession duties range from 1½ to 2½ per cent. A tax of $200 has to be paid by commercial travellers.

MANITOBA.

The liquor licenses have been increased in Manitoba and are taken by the Provinces. Succession duties have been imposed ranging from 2 to 10 per cent. Large portions of the population paying for their own schools have also been made to pay towards the public schools and thus to relieve the Provincial treasury.

PURISTS, INDEED!

LIBERAL CORRUPTION AT ELECTIONS.

After the general election for the House of Commons in 1891, there were 24 supporters of Mr. Laurier unseated, more than a quarter of the Liberal representation. Their names and seats were as follows:—

MR. TROW, South Perth.

MR. GIBSON, Lincoln.

MR. TARTE, Montmorency.

MR. BORDEN, King's, N. S.

DR. SPOHN, East Simcoe.

MR. TRUAX, East Bruce.

MR. FORBES, Queen's, N. S.

MR. BARRON, North Victoria.

MR. HARGRAFT, West Northumberland.

MR. GERMAN, Welland.

MR. M. C. CAMERON, West Huron.

MR. PROULX, Prescott.

MR. DAVIDSON, South Ontario.

MR. HYMAN, London.

MR. MURRAY, Pontiac.

MR. GAUTHIER, L'Assomption.

MR. COLTER, Carlton, N. B

MR. GRIEVE, North Perth.

MR. HARWOOD, Vaudreuil.

MR. MOUSSEAU, Soulanges.

MR. ALLISON, Lennox.

MR. FEATHERSTON, Peel.

MR. BROWN, Monck.

MR. BOWERS, Digby.

MR. SAVARD, Chicoutimi and Laguenay.

It was proved that a large portion of the Liberals' corruption fund was contributed by Mr. Mercier, the Liberal Premier of Quebec, and his allies, from the money they boodled from the people of Quebec.

This wholesale corruption of the constituencies by the Liberals was nothing new, as is shown in the records of the courts.

In 1874 Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues dissolved the House to have one elected more purely.

The result was that the following supporters of the Liberal Administration lost their seats for bribery and corruption at the general election and subsequent by-elections—31 in all:—

MAJOR JOHN WALKER, London.

MR. M. C. CAMERON, Huron.

MR. H. H. COOK, N. Simcoe.

MR. NORRIS, Lincoln.

MR. SHIBLEY, Addington.

MR. JODOIN, Chambly.

MR. McGREGOR, N. Essex.

MR. IRVING, Hamilton.

MR. WOOD, Hamilton.

MR. DEVLIN, C. Montreal.

MR. BIGGAR, E. Northumberland.

MR. AYLMER, Richmond and Wolfe.

MR. WILKES, C. Toronto.

MR. PREVOST, Two Mountains.

MR. HIGGINBOTHAM, N. Wellington.

MR. CUSHING, Argenteuil.

MR. TREMBLAY, Charlevoix.

MR. MACDONALD, Cornwall.

MR. McNAB, Glengarry.

MR. MACKENZIE, W. Montreal.

MR. STUART, S. Norfolk.

MR. KERR, W. Northumberland.

MR. J. LORNE McDOUGALL, S Renfrew.

MR. O'DONOGHUE, E. Toronto.

MR. DYMOND, N. York.

MR. MURRAY, N. Renfrew.

MR. McKAY, Colchester.

MR. CHISHOLM, Halton.

Major Walker, one of those unseated, spent over $10,000. Thirteen of his supporters were reported by the

court for disqualification. It was one of them, Madiver, who wrote to a friend:—"Come along, John; come and help us put down bribery and corruption. Vote for Walker," adding, "Tear this up and burn it. Come along, John; we have lots of money." The judge declared the corruption was unprecedented in his experience. Another agent, Dr. Haggarty, confessed, "I spent between $500 and $600. About $300 I spent in treating and influencing." He was rewarded by the Mackenzie Administration with a position in the North-west. Col. Walker's reward came from the Mowat Administration, a registrarship.

Mr. H. H. Cook, who was unseated for bribery, confessed to spending $28,000 in two elections. "In 1871 I spent $13,000, in 1872 $15,000; in 1874 my expenditure was much smaller." The Hon. D. Mills gave him (after their defeat of 1878) an enormous timber limit in the North-west.

Mr. Malcolm C. Cameron, unseated for bribery, confessed in court to spending from $10,000 to $14,000. In a pamphlet he boasted:—"I spent time and money in carrying South Ontario and defeating an ex-Minister of the Crown." He also confessed:—"I spent $6,000 in contesting Russell, which contest I claim to have had a good effect in subsequently securing that constituency for the Reform party."

In the same election of 1874, the manager of the Ontario Bank, by instructions from the Hon. John Simpson, President, wrote to customers of the bank a letter, in which it was said:—"We are largely interested in the success of the present Government, and its continuance in power will add largely to the success and prosperity of the bank." The writer then urged the person to whom the letter was addressed to vote and work for the Liberal candidate. Sir Richard Cartwright did not fail to hand over the anticipated reward, for he greatly increased the Government deposits in the bank, not bearing interest. Mr. Simpson's own description in court of his proceedings was:—"I mesmerized them in batches of 15 or 16, and turned 100 that night at Glen's."

It was the same Hon. John Simpson to whom the Hon. George Brown, the great chief of the party, wrote in reference to a Provincial election:—"We must make a big push on polling day; will you come down handsomely?" Mr. Justice Wilson declared of Mr. Geo. Brown's letter:—"It is a letter written for corrupt purposes, to interfere with freedom of election. It is an invitation to the recipient, as one, with some others and the writer, to concur in committing bribery and corruption at the polls."

In 1878 they were either more moderate or covered their tracks, having only five unseated for corrupt practices, Messrs. Hughes, Niagara; Aylsworth, East Hastings; Christie, Argenteuil; Wheler, North Ontario, and La Rue, Bellechasse.

In 1882 the Liberals were still more careful, having only two of their candidates unseated for corrupt practices at the general election and subsequent by-elections, Mr. D. W. Allison, Lennox, and Mr. G. W. Ross, West Middlesex, now Minister of Education in the Mowat Administration.

In 1887 they returned to their old practices, having the following candidates unseated for corrupt practices at the general election and subsequent bye-elections:—

J. WALDIE, Halton.
ARCH. CAMPBELL, Kent, Ont.
JOS. GAUTHIER, L'Assomption.
A. E. MALLORY, East Northumberland.
J. M. PLATT, Prince Edward.
W. C. EDWARDS, Russell.
THOS. ROBERTSON, Shelburne.
J. LOVITT, Yarmouth.
C. W. COLTER, Haldimand.

Thus, since the trials of election cases were entrusted to the judges, in 1873, no less than 72 cases have occurred of Liberals being unseated for corrupt practices, while on the Conservative side there were only 56 cases among a far larger number of elections, they having been in a considerable majority most of the time.

Voters, these are the gentlemen who want to get into power to raise the standard of political purity.

The Liberal Party and Superannuation.

As some of the mouthpieces of the Liberal party are loud in attacks upon the superannuation expenditure by the Conservative administration, it is well to examine the policy and practice of the Liberals when in power and the effect upon the superannuation fund to the present day.

In their five years of office, from November, 1873, to October, 1878, the Liberal Ministry, under Mr. Mackenzie and Sir R. Cartwright, used the power of superannuating civil servants to a greater extent, at larger cost and more profusely than ever before or since.

Up to June 30th, 1895, the civil servants superannuated by the Mackenzie administration in the five short years it lasted, had drawn from the superannuation fund the sum of $950,002. As the total expenditure for the superannuation up to that date had been $4,030,350, the Liberals for their five years had incurred very nearly a quarter of the outlay, an enormous overproportion from any point of view. And in the fiscal year 1894-5, 33 civil servants, superannuated by the Liberals, were still on the list and drew $16,170, so that the weight thus placed on the fund is far from being removed at present.

To these five years of Liberal administration may be largely attributed the burden on the superannuation fund.

The following are the civil servants superannuated by the Liberals during their term of office from 1874 to 1878, and who are still alive in 1894-5:—

SUPERANNUATED BY LIBERALS; STILL ALIVE IN 1894-95.

Name	Department	Age at Super'tion.	Received in 1894-5.	Total Since Super'ed.
Agnew, W.	Customs	59	$ 588 00	$ 9,849 00
Bolly, Jno.	Agriculture	63	166 56	2,789 88
Cameron, Rev. J.	Sta'tical Office, Hfx.	—	252 74	4,519 30
Clute, J. S.	Customs	80	396 14	6,746 08
Condon, Wm.	Marine	56	178 56	3,853 92
Cook, Celia	Canals	54	60 84	1,257 40
Eager, J. B.	Post Office	42	499 56	9,116 97
Ferland, S.	Agriculture	36	202 08	4,959 18
French, T. B.	Public Works	69	617 16	11,055 45
Godin, L.	Canals	62	217 68	4,643 84
Hall, J.	Customs	63	434 52	7,785 15
Howe, John.	Post Office	62	1,399 92	26,598 42
Hunter, Jas.	Canals	65	97 08	1,990 14
Kimber, R.	Parliament	59	1,048 80	21,130 68
King, J. W.	Justice	46	608 04	12,608 69
La Croix, H.	Customs	50	675 10	12,605 66
Le Sueur, P.	Post Office	63	1,024 32	18,150 25
Lindsay, A.	T'nty House, Que.	42	783 36	15,275 52
Lowden, H. J.	Marine	57	285 60	5,474 00
Meredith, E. A.	Interior	62	2,520 00	42,000 00
McMillan, Rev. H.	Sta'tical Offi., Hfx.	41	488 88	8,636 88
Nutting, C. M.	Sta'tical Offi., Hfx.	—	145 56	2,607 95
Perkins, T.	Customs	66	360 00	6,076 70
Purcell, Jas.	Customs	60	366 48	6,476 54
Quinn, F.	Inland Revenue	45	347 76	7,245 00
Ryan, A.	Sta'tical Offi., Hfx.	—	75 72	1,356 65
St. Amour, Is.	Post Office	37	150 72	3,014 35
Tuck, Geo.	Customs	62	114 00	2,280 00
Woodgate, A.	Post Office	62	1,553 45	31,176 56
	DIED IN 1894-95.			
Ahern, Wm.	Canals	59	109 53	7,922 67
Burland, B.	Customs	72	210 00	14,140 00
Hill, Thos.	Marine	62	216 81	3,446 05
Rhodes, J.	State	49	115 20	2,092 36
Total			$16,169 37	$317,751 34

Some of the civil servants superannuated by the Liberals have drawn the following amounts to June 30th, 1895:—

John Langton, Auditor-General	$42,558
E. A. Meredith, Deputy Minister Interior	42,000
Geo. Futvoye, Deputy Minister Militia	39,139
H. Bernard, Deputy Minister Justice	33,071
A. Woodgate, Inspector Post Offices, N. S.	31,176

This shows how enormously the superannuation fund was burdened by the administration of Mr. Mackenzie and Sir R. Cartwright. To ascertain how and why the burden was incurred one or two salient examples may be taken.

Mr. Langton, who stands at the top of the list, having drawn the largest amount of superannuation in the history of Canada, was superannuated a few months before the Liberals resigned. He lived for sixteen years longer, and for half of that time received a good salary as one of the financial officers of a joint stock company, strong evidence of his recognized capacity for further work of that nature. But though he could have continued to fill it, his post as Auditor-General was wanted for a zealous, if somewhat unfortunate, friend of the Liberal administration, so Mr. Langton was unnecessarily shelved at a cost to the country of $42,550. Ten years were added to his term of service to complete his annuity, a practice against which the Liberals now inveigh.

Mr. E. A. Meredith, the next on the list, was also superannuated on the eve of the departure of the Liberals from office. He, too, has since served—and is still serving—at a liberal salary one of the great financial institutions of the country, so he also is plainly valued as being still fitted for work, seventeen years later, but his office was also wanted for a friend of the administration. In his case an addition of three years was made to his term of service to complete his allowance.

Further investigation would show similar practices in other cases of superannuation by the Liberals.*

Loud complaints have been made by the Liberals that the Conservatives have added years to the term of service to add to the pension to make up the minimum qualifying term of service. Mr. McMullen, M. P., gave in the House a table, published in Hansard, of certain superannuated civil servants, with their length of service and years added, prefacing the list by the observation, "I will give a few more names to show how this act has been abused." Yet in this list of fourteen asserted Conservative abuses, five only were superannuations by the Conservatives, and no less than nine by the Liberals.**

But this is not all. In the five years of Liberal administration they added years to the time of actual service in 34 cases of superannuation; the years thus added totalled 269, the average time added was eight years, the percentage of years added to actual service was 42; the number of cases under the ten years limit was 9, the time served in two cases being only 3 years, and two others only 5 years.

*Mr. McMullen aptly characterized the practice when he said in the House: "Every possible excuse that can be used in order to superannuate men who were filling lucrative positions that were wanted for others," but forgot to add that the description applied to his friends.—Hansard, June 5th, 1895. P. 2218.

**Hansard, June 5, 1895, 2217:—In a subsequent table professing to give amounts paid in and received, Mr. McMullen includes a number of superannuations by the Liberals, though expressly stating that all were superannuated by Conservatives.

As a means of comparison it may be stated that in the five years under Conservative administration from 1891 to 1895 (the latest given in detail) there were 15 cases of added years against the Liberals 34; the years amounted to 88½ against the Liberals' 269; the average time added was less than 6 years against the Liberals' 8; the percentage of years added to actual service was 30 against the Liberals' 42; the number of cases under the ten years' limit was 2 against the Liberals' 9; and in no case were the years of actual service less than five.

Nor was the former Conservative administration of superannuation a precedent for the reckless management of the Liberals. In the three years and a half from the adoption of the system to the assumption of office by the Hon. A. Mackenzie, there were 14 cases of added time as against the Liberals' 34 in five years; the years added amounted to 96 against the Liberals' 269; the average time added was 7 years against the Liberals' 8; the percentage of years added to actual service was 37 against the Liberals' 42; the number of cases under the ten years' limit was only one against the Liberals' 9, and in that case only one year was wanting, whereas two of the Liberal cases were of three years' service and two others five years.

In another manner the Liberal administration overloaded the superannuation fund. Their superannuations, where the ages are given, averaged an age of 59 years, less than the minimum, 60 years, prescribed for superannuation without exceptional circumstances. Besides this, in 6 per cent. of the cases, the age is not given, thus probably concealing some of the worst cases. Altogether, as far as confessed, 28 per cent. of their superannuations were under 60 years, of which 12 per cent. were under 50 years, 5 per cent. being even under forty.

Comparing as before the Conservative administration, for the last five-year period, their superannuations averaged nearly 64 years—well over the minimum age instead of being below it, and only in a single case is the age not given.

Apologists* for the mismanagement of the superannuation fund by the Liberals have published a list of civil servants with the sums paid by them into the superannuation fund and received from it. Nearly half of these gentlemen were superannuated, not by the Conservatives, as is insinuated, but by the Mackenzie administration. They are as follows, with the amounts received brought down to the end of the last fiscal year:

* Liberal campaign sheet, published by Alex. Smith, Secretary Ontario Liberal Association, "Facts for the People," No. 1, page 11.

LIBERALS SUPERANNUATED—PAYMENTS IN AND OUT.

Names.	Offices.	Paid to fund.	Received from fund.
		$	$
Futvoye, Geo.	Dy. Minister of Militia	420.00	39,149.25
Kimber, R.	Gentleman Usher Black Rod	271.71	20,081.88
Langton, J.	Auditor General	847.00	42,557.56
Lesueur, P.	Gen. Supt. Money Order Office	487.42	18,150.25
Meredith, E. A.	Dy. Minister of Interior	839.25	42,000.00
Woodgate, A.	Inspector of Post Offices, N. S.	324.00	31,176.56
Totals		$2,989.38	$193,105.50

This is the manner in which the Liberal Administration loaded the superannuation fund, the load still continuing, for most of these gentlemen are alive and drawing their allowance. And these are only a few cases out of many, for which they are responsible.

Opposition apologists, endeavoring to shirk their responsibility for these cases and to throw it upon the Conservatives, describe them as examples showing "how the present act works." This is a wilful misrepresentation; the act under which the Liberals placed these burdens on the revenue has been repealed by the Conservatives, and the present act makes the fund self-sustaining for all new cases.

A superannuation system for the civil service is generally considered desirable as tending to promote its efficiency. In the absence of some such provision there is a very natural reluctance to discharge old public servants without strong reason, and a tendency to show leniency in the case of failing powers as long as possible, while a superannuation allowance removes this hesitation, as soon as a change seems to promise greater efficiency, which often means also greater economy. For this and other reasons, not only governments, but also banks, railway companies, &c., having large staffs have established and maintained superannuation funds.

The Dominion of Canada enacted a superannuation system for its civil service in 1870, a rate of abatement on official salaries being fixed that would have carried it through with little or no cost to the country. In 1872, however, the unfortunate sympathy of Parliament overcame its discretion, and the abatement was lowered to one and a quarter per cent. on salaries under $600, and two per cent. on salaries of $600 or more.

The abatement thus reduced was insufficient, especially in view of the recklessness of the Mackenzie Administration in superannuating prematurely to make vacancies for their friends, and adding inordinately to the years of actual service in computing the allowance, so that not only no reserve could be formed, but the superannuation fund, from the receipts exceeding the expenditures, as was the case when they took office, was brought, under their administration, to the position of the expenditures far more than doubling the receipts.

In 1893 the Finance Minister procured the enactment of a law establishing the superannuation fund for all civil servants appointed thereafter on a sure basis, the abatement being made three per cent. on salaries under $600 and three and a half per cent. on salaries of that amount or more, and a fund established with interest calculated to maintain a reserve actually sufficient to meet future demands. Thus the civil service has secured to it a permanent superannuation system, while the country is ensured against excessive cost.

Such is the actual record of the Liberal Administration as compared with that of the Conservatives in respect to superannuation.

EFFORTS TO SECURE RECIPROCITY WITH UNITED STATES.

The Uselessness of the Reciprocity Cry Demonstrated.

Efforts have been made from time to time by Canada, both before and since Confederation, to secure reciprocity with the United States, the principal steps taken being as follows:—A list of these efforts, almost all of which have failed, is the best answer to the Liberal cry that they will get reciprocity if returned to power.

1. The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada passed an address to the Imperial Government to open negotiations with the United States for reciprocity in free admission of goods from either country to the other..A. D. 1847

2. The Canadian Legislature reduced duties on imports from the United States from 12½ to 7½ per cent., and raised duties on British goods from 5 to 7½ per cent. United States did not respond.....1847

3. The Canadian Legislature enacted that certain products of United States should be admitted free, when United States admitted similar goods free from Canada. United States House of Retpresentatives passed similar law, but Senate would not accept it..1849

4. Sir F. Hincks visited Washington on behalf of Canadian Provinces in favor of reciprocity. United States Senate refused to act.... 1850

5. Reciprocity treaty negotiated.1854

6. Reciprocity treaty came in force.... 1855

7. Notice of abrogation of reciprocity treaty given by United States, against wish of Canada.... 1865

8. Reciprocity treaty expired, according to notice given by United States.... 1866

9. Sir A. Galt and Hon. H. P. Howland, from Province of Canada; Hon. W. A. Henry, from Nova Scotia, and Hon. A. J. Smith, from New Brunswick, were sent to Washington to co-operate with Sir F. Bruce, British Minister, in urging renewal of reciprocity treaty. United States declined.... 1865

10. In the first session after Confederation the Parliament of Canada enacted that certain products of United States should be admitted free, or at reduced duty, when United States treated similar Canadian goods in the same way. This offer was never reciprocated.... 1868

11. Sir J. Rose was sent by Canadian Government to cooperate with Sir E. Thornton, British Minister, in negotiat- reciprocity treaty. United States would not accept proposals.... 1869

12. Sir J. Macdonald and his British colleagues on the joint commission which negotiated Washington treaty, proposed that the reciprocity treaty should be restored. United States Commissioners refused.... 1871

13. The United States National Board of Trade petitioned Congress for renewal of reciprocity, and the Macdonald administration in council formally declared its readiness.1871

14. The Mackenzie administration sent Hon. Geo. Brown to Washington to co-operate with Sir E. Thornton, British Minister, in negotiating reciprocity treaty. A treaty was agreed to, but United States Senate would not ratify it.... 1874

15. The Customs Tariff Act, inaugurating the National Policy, offered access free or at reduced duty to certain United States products, if United States acted similarly with Canadian goods.... 1879

16. The United States abrogated clauses of the Washington treaty bearing on trade in fish with Canada.. 1885

17. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., acting in conjunction with Sir Sackville West, now Lord Sackville, and Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, British Plenipotentiaries, to negotiate treaty at Washington as to fisheries, etc., proposed to discuss arrangements for greater freedom of commercial intercourse as part of settlement. United States Plenipotentiaries refused to discuss tariff question. 1887

18. Treaty negotiated by above-mentioned commissioners was signed, but United States Senate refused to ratify it..1888

19. The Act to amend the Customs Act renewed offer to make certain goods free on reciprocal action by United States, the list of articles being somewhat changed ..1888

20. Suggestions were made by Canada through the British authorities for inclusion with Newfoundland in arrangements as to fisheries, trade, etc., with the United States. The United States authorities replied that separate arrangements with Canada would be considered.. 1890

21. Canadian Ministers were sent to act with the British Ambassador in informal meetings with United States Ministers to discuss question between the two countries. The meetings were postponed by United States authorities.1891

22. Some of the Canadian Ministers, with the British Ambassador, had informal interviews with United States Ministers at Washington as to fisheries, boundaries, wrecking, and other matters in dispute. Reciprocity was mentioned, but no action was taken, the United States Ministers holding that similar tariffs, and discriminations against other countries, including the United Kingdom, were essential.... 1892

23. The Customs Tariff Act of 1894 proposed in several clauses to remit or reduce duties on various articles produced by the United States in return for similar concessions to Canada. These have not been reciprocated.... 1894

The fact is that time after time, year after year, Government after Government, have made faithful efforts to secure fair trade relations with the United States.

The Americans have refused.

They have shown no signs recently that they have relented. Indeed, the American people are guarding now more strongly than ever their home markets.

The Liberal cry that they, if returned to power, will get reciprocity, is simply an election cry.

The duty of Canadians is to guard their own markets until they get a fair share of other markets in return for what they give others.

That is the Conservative policy.

THE LIBERALS AND AUSTRALIAN TRADE.

One of the shining lights of the Patrons of Industry, Mr. J. Lockie-Wilson, introduced into the recent campaign in North Ontario and exhibited in all the public meetings in that contest a can of Australian mutton, and he charged that the Government of Canada had subsidized a line of steamships to ply betwen British Columbia and New South Wales for the purpose of bringing Australian mutton to Canada to compete with, and to injure the Canadian farmer. The Liberal party, it seems, have adopted Mr. Wilson's idea, and in their campaign sheet No. 1 have endeavored to make capital out of it.

The Government of Canada and the Government of New South Wales united in the establishing of this new line of steamships; each contribute to the subsidy; the object in each case is the same, namely, to increase trade between Australia and Canada. It was felt that the time had come when direct facilities should be afforded for the development of such trade. For years Canada had furnished Australia with a large portion of certain food products, and Australia had furnished Canada with certain of its products; but the trade had been done either through Great Britain or through the United States, and toll had been paid in all cases to unnecessary middlemen. Hence the line was established, and the Governments of both colonies are encouraged to hope great things from it, because, so fast has trade increased that the ships of the line on several occasions have been unable to take all the freight offered, and it is quite within the probable that the company without further subsidy will double the frequency of the sailings.

Now, it will be admitted that an increased trade is a good thing; but it is said that this increase is prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian farmer. Australian wool is largely brought into Canada to be used by the Canadian woollen manufacturers. This is pointed to as a case where the Canadian farmer suffers from the operation of this line. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Our manufacturers must have the fine wools of Australia; nothing but fine wool is produced there; it has been coming to Canada for years; it is not coming now in a greater volume than before, except as the population and manufacturers of Canada increase. The only difference is that this fine wool of Australia, not produced in Canada at all, which must be had by our manufacturers, which always has been used by them, now comes direct from Australia to Canada without paying toll either to London or to New York, instead of coming, as it formerly did, through British or Yankee channels. The coarse wools of Canada do not enter into competition at all with the fine wools of Australia, and the Canadian wool-producer is not injured one cent by the change which has been wrought by the Australian line of steamships.

It is also said that mutton and canned meats are being so largely imported by this line as to seriously injure the Canadian farmer. Let us examine the Trade and Navigation Returns, and see how far this charge is justified:—

For the year ending June 30, 1894, there was imported from Australia into Canada:—

350,919 lbs. of canned meat of the value of	$31,461
54,351 lbs. of mutton, of the value of	1,586
54,420 lbs. of butter, of the value of	9,547
A total for the year of	$42,594

For the next year, ending June 30, 1895, there was imported:—

202,588 lbs. of canned meat, of the value of	$14,258
16,052 lbs. of mutton, of the value of	577
39,516 lbs. of butter, of the value of	6,286
Making a total for the last year of	$21,121

$21,121 worth, as against $42,594 in the preceding year, a decrease of more than half, and this statement for both years includes bacons, hams and salted beef.

For nine months of the current year there has not been a pound of mutton or a pound of butter imported; and the importation of canned meats has fallen to 126,600 lbs., or a decrease of more than 50 per cent. of what was imported in 1894.

What the importations would be were the Liberal party to come into power, and if they were to do as they promise, namely, to remove the protection, it is difficult to say; but it is more than likely that in that case the evil, which does not now exist, would rapidly become a menace to the agricultural interests of Canada.

To-day, before entrance is possible into Canada, canned meats must pay a duty of 25 per cent., frozen mutton a duty of 35 per cent., and butter a duty of 4 cents per lb. When the Liberals come into power with their system of free trade as it is in England, all these articles will come in free. Which do the farmers prefer?

Now, take the other side of the question and let us see how the interests of the Canadian farmer are affected by this line.

The steamship Miowera, of this line, which left Vancouver on the first day of March last, took out 78,000 lbs. of Canadian flour and 20,000 bushels of Canadian wheat for consumption in Australia; and the last steamer, namely, the Warrimoo, which sailed from Vancouver on the 30th of March, took out 45,460 lbs. of Canadian flour; and arrangements have been made for two full cargoes of Canadian wheat, to be taken to Australia by vessels of this line during the month of April.

From the actual facts, then, it appears that the advantages are altogether with the Canadian farmer so far as the trade in agricultural productions has so far been developed; and it is known to everyone that this new market for the manufacturers of Canada is developing by leaps and bounds.

The same campaign sheet insinuates that the fast line on the Atlantic, if it is ever established, will be prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian farmer. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The great object which the Government have in the establishment of that line is to benefit the Canadian farmer; to give him such rapid transit for his butter, cheese, fresh beef, bacon and other productions, accompanied with cold storage facilities as will practically put him upon an even plane of competition in the British market with France, Holland and Denmark.

THE LESSON OF THE UNITED STATES.

In 1891 and 1892 the Democrats in the United States carried on a campaign for what they called tariff reform on free trade lines. They had the same ideas as the Canadian Liberals today. The freeing of trade from the trammels of protection was to be followed by a great expansion of commerce, and everyone was to prosper. The people of the United States believed the Democrats, just as some of the people of Canada believe the Liberals.

Mr. Cleveland was elected to the presidency. The Democrats were given control of Congress by a great majority. The tariff reform bill was introduced, worried over for months and finally passed. The good times did not come. Commerce did not boom. The people did not get rich.

The reverse was the case. Seven hundred and sixteen banks suspended payment in one year. Companies owning one-third of the railway mileage in the country went into bankruptcy. Exports fell off from $1,015,732,011 in 1892 to $860,053,158 in 1894—a loss to the people of the United States of $146,679,853 in one year. Money became scarce. Failures increased. Wages were cut down. People were thrown out of work altogether, so that the wages paid in the United States to her mechanics and workmen fell from $2,282,823,265 in 1892 to $1,255,552,990 in 1894—a loss to the people of upwards of $1,000,000,000. Products of the manufacturers fell from $9,370,107,624 down to $5,247,260,269—a loss to the nation of her natural wealth of $4,022,847,355 in one year. Money had to be borrowed to pay the regular expenses of the Government.

Then the time came for the people to speak and they elected, by an overwhelming majority, a Republican Congress pledged to maintain a tariff for the protection of U. S. business, U. S. workingmen and U. S. capital. They had repented of the folly that led them to follow Democratic free traders' advice, and they had reason to.

These are simple facts from the history of the past five years. The lesson they convey to Canadians is written large.

He is a fool who runs to burn himself in the fire that scorched his neighbor.

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

The annual Provincial subsidies are at present as follows:—

Ontario	$1,339,287 28
Quebec	1,086,713 48
Nova Scotia	432,814 09
New Brunswick	483,569 68
Manitoba	437,600 54
British Columbia	243,585 46
Prince Edward Island	221,051 98
Total	$4,244,622 51

Taking the census figures of 1891 (omitting the Territories) the subsidies amount to 89½ cents a head of the population of Canada.

Taking the census figures of 1891 for British Columbia the subsidy of the Province amounts to $2.48 a head of the population.

ITEMS COMPOSING PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA.

The objects for which the public debt of Canada has been incurred are as follows:—

PROVINCIAL DEBTS ASSUMED BY DOMINION.

At Confederation—		
Province of Canada	$62,500,000	
Nova Scotia	8,000,000	
New Brunswick	7,000,000	
		$77,500,000
Assumed or allowed subsequently—		
Nova Scotia (1869)	$ 1,186,756	
Province of Canada (1873)	10,506,089	
Ontario	2,848,289	
Quebec	2,549,214	
Nova Scotia	2,343,059	
New Brunswick	1,807,720	
Manitoba	3,775,606	
British Columbia	2,029,392	
Prince Edward Island	4,844,023	
		$31,930,148
		$109,430,148
Railways—		
Intercolonial and P. E. Island	$45,929,860	
Canadian Pacific Railway	62,635,745	
		$108,583,605
Canals		44,161,312
		$262,175,065

As the net debt of Canada in July, 1895, was only $253,074,927, there must have been applied to these objects $9,100,138 from yearly revenue, out of which were also paid large sums for parliamentary and departmental buildings at Ottawa, other public works and buildings, Northwest Territories, Dominion Lands, repurchase of lands from Canadian Pacific Railway, aids to other railways, and $2,664,539 for net deficit of the Mackenzie administration.

The net public debt at Confederation was $75,728,641, so the increase to June 30th, 1895, was $177,346,286.